DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 415 766 HE 030 912

TITLE	Adjunct Faculty Morale and Faculty Development.
INSTITUTION	Burlington Coll., VT.
SPONS AGENCY	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1991-08-14
NOTE	57p.
CONTRACT	P116B91393
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adjunct Faculty; College Faculty; *College Instruction; Collegiality; Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Interdisciplinary Approach; Seminars; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Collaboration; *Teacher Morale; Teacher Workshops; *Teaching Conditions
IDENTIFIERS	*Burlington College VT

ABSTRACT

A series of 10 seminars on teaching and learning across the curriculum were offered at Burlington College (Vermont) to improve faculty morale and to provide faculty development at this college which relies on an all-adjunct faculty. These interdisciplinary seminars focused on local context and culture. The 32 participants, who were paid an honorarium, were required to write papers on any aspect of teaching and learning at the college. While half of the seminars focused on these papers, the remainder focused on general considerations, such as teachers as classroom researchers, the philosophy of education, and learning theories. All participants rated the seminars highly; they viewed the seminars as an opportunity to work with other faculty and appreciated the interdisciplinary experience. In addition, a questionnaire was completed by 53 faculty at the college to obtain demographic information, along with faculty ratings on both the importance of and satisfaction with 41 items related to faculty morale and faculty development. Interview and survey findings indicated high morale among adjunct faculty in a variety of areas such as academic freedom, small class size, and student support services. However, the greatest gaps between faculty expectations and satisfaction centered on compensation for teaching and nonteaching functions. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 415 766

Adjunct Faculty
Morale and Faculty Development

GRANTEE:

Burlington College
95 North Avenue
Burlington, VT 05401

GRANT NO.:

P116B91393

PROJ. DATES:

Starting: 15 August 1989
Ending: 14 August 1991
No. Mos.: 24

PROJ. DIR.:

Louis M. Colasanti
Educational Resources Center
Burlington College
95 North Avenue
Burlington, VT 05401
Tele.: [802] 862-9616

FIPSE Program Officers:

Year 1: David Holmes
Year 2: Lewis Greenstein

Grant Award:

Year 1: $40,850
Year 2: 39,862
Total: $80,712

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 030 912

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY PARAGRAPH

"Adjunct Faculty Morale
&
Faculty Development"

FIPSE Proj. No.: P116B91393

Burlington College
Burlington, VT 05401

To improve faculty morale and faculty development at this all-adjunct College, faculty were offered a series of seminars on "Teaching & Learning Across the Curriculum." These interdisciplinary seminars built upon the strengths and competencies of the faculty, and focused on local context and culture. Participants, who were paid an honorarium, were also required to write papers, which were published and distributed in-house to promote discourse throughout the community. The seminars were rated highly by all participants in comments and a post-seminar eval. Through interviews and a questionnaire, staff also conducted a College-wide survey on adjunct morale and adjunct faculty development.

Louis M. Colasanti
Educational Resources Center
Burlington College
95 North Ave.
Burlington, VT 05401
Tele: [802] 862-9616

ADJUNCT FACULTY MORALE
&
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Executive Summary
FIPSE Project #P116B91393

Burlington College
95 North Ave.
Burlington, VT 05401

Louis M. Colasanti
Educational Resources Center
Burlington College
Burlington, VT 05401
[802] 862-9616

FINAL REPORT
Table of Contents

Project Overview: Adjunct Faculty Morale & Faculty Development 1

Problem & Purpose: The Local Problem & the National Context 4

- The Growing Use of Adjunct Faculty
- The Changing Identity of Adjuncts
- The Problematics of an Adjunct Work Force
- Adjunct Faculty Morale & Faculty Development

Background & Origins: The Local Context in Detail 8

- The Immediate Context for the Project
- The Early History: Community & Commitment
- A Limit to Growth?

Project Description: Adjunct Faculty Morale & Faculty Development 12

- Original Design -- "Teaching & Learning Across the Curriculum"
- Key Assumptions
- Project Activities
  - The Interviews
  - Evaluation & Questionnaire -- Contents & Methods
    - The Post-Seminar Evaluation
    - The Questionnaire on Faculty Morale & Faculty Development

Project Results: Adjunct Faculty Morale & a Model for Faculty Development 22

- Sources
- Developments & Outcomes
  - Adjunct Faculty Morale
    - What's Most Important?
    - What's Most Satisfying?
    - The Gaps between Importance & Satisfaction
  - A Prospectus on Adjunct Faculty Morale
  - The Seminars
    - The extended format of the seminars
    - The emphasis on faculty experience
    - The emphasis on the local context
    - The idea of teacher-as-researcher
    - The writing requirement
    - The interdisciplinary membership
    - Payment for Involvement
  - The Negative Aspects of the Seminars
  - A Prospectus on Adjunct Faculty Development

Summary & Conclusions: High Hopes in a Context of Limited Resources 44

Appendices ff

Project Overview: Adjunct Faculty Morale & Faculty Development

As with most colleges and universities, Burlington College faced the many questions accompanying the employment of adjunct faculty. But unlike most other institutions, which employ a limited, albeit increasing, number of adjuncts, Burlington College, from its beginnings in 1972, has relied entirely upon an all-adjunct faculty.

In the months prior to the preliminary FIPSE proposal, certain of those questions were becoming acutely 'felt', particularly, questions of adjunct faculty morale and faculty development. Academic administrative staff and some faculty were concerned about the low attendance and mixed agenda of faculty meetings. But faculty were also expressing increasing frustrations with issues of pay, a lack of discriminating criteria to distinguish "core" or "senior" faculty from new-comers, and what one faculty referred to as their "second-class status" as members of the College. Finally, a visiting team report from the New England Association pointed to the need to "assure a functional and effective system of governance which includes an organized and appropriate role for faculty."

After considerable discussion -- among members of the academic staff, Faculty Association reps, other adjuncts, and the President -- a proposal was submitted to FIPSE which, all thought, would improve both faculty morale and faculty development. The idea was simple: A series of interdisciplinary faculty seminars on "Teaching & Learning Across the Curriculum" would invite faculty to focus on the classroom, draw on the competencies and questions of the faculty themselves, and require participants to write papers on "any aspect of teaching and learning." At the end of each seminar, papers would be published and distributed in-house to promote wider discourse on teaching and learning throughout the College.

In addition to the seminars, project staff -- a half-time director and 2/5ths-time administrative assistant -- also compiled a faculty database and conducted a comprehensive survey on faculty morale and faculty development through interviews and a faculty-wide questionnaire. Thus, after two years, some 30 (roughly 40%) of the College's all-adjunct faculty have participated in the seminars, and participant assessments rated it highly in both post-seminar evaluations and interviews. Five editions of collected faculty papers were published and distributed and, in turn, have promoted wider discourse throughout the College. Moreover, the seminars and other project activities have contributed to changes in both approaches to and funding for faculty development activities. And the survey on adjunct faculty morale has resulted in increased clarity on the issues most affecting faculty morale -- positively and otherwise -- for all faculty, as well as for sub-groupings of veteran vs. new faculty, and seminar participants vs. others.

Problem & Purpose: The Local Problem & the National Context

The problems facing both adjunct faculty and the institutions which employ them are relatively new. First, as student demographics have shifted over the past fifteen or so years, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of adjuncts employed nationwide to 'cover' the courses and sections required to maintain programs. But, the growing number of adjunct slots were no longer being filled by resident and tenured faculty, as they had once been. Rather, the new adjuncts represented a work force from outside the institution, a work force often greeted with suspicion or scorn by the resident and tenured faculty, who saw them as threats to departmental growth or, at best, unconnected with the institutional culture.

Even with the eventual acceptance of adjuncts by regular faculty, however, there remained problems of both faculty morale and faculty development. Unlike resident faculty, who are insured some form of faculty development and who are integrally a part of the institution, adjuncts are least likely to benefit from faculty development initiatives and, moreover, are structurally disenfranchised, a situation which prompted at least one adjunct to refer to adjuncts as "the migrant workers of higher education."

Background & Origins: The Local Context in Detail

As was noted, the local context for the FIPSE project at Burlington College concerned the growing frustration of the all-adjunct faculty with a variety of issues, including their sense of second-class status, and the desire, at least for some, to focus on faculty development. The years immediately preceding the project saw a significant drop in attendance at faculty meetings, which increasingly had lost their focus on questions of teaching and learning, and become a forum for, first, the administrative requirements incumbent on faculty, and, eventually, the political agenda emerging from the faculty's sense of disenfranchisement.

Despite these difficulties, the early history of the College showed an unusual and strong sense of both community and commitment -- among staff, students, and faculty -- a sense which continues still. Moreover, the all-adjunct faculty were, unlike the few administrative staff, paid well for the time and the geographic area -- half of tuition was paid out to the faculty. But today -- with around 200 students, and despite a significant increase in tuition -- the relative success has brought with it the strain of inflation on limited resources, growing costs for administrative staff, and for plant facilities, first acquired in the early '80s to control increasing costs for rent. In the interim, faculty pay has fallen to about 20% of total tuition revenues.

Project Description: Adjunct Faculty Morale & Faculty Development

The original design of the project aimed at 30-40 participants in a series of faculty development seminars on "Teaching & Learning Across the Curriculum." Faculty from various disciplines were invited to attend a series of ten seminar sessions, during which they would focus on issues of teaching and learning encountered in their classrooms, and by the end of which they would have written a paper on subjects of their choice, to be published and distributed in-house to all faculty. The first half of the seminars would focus on more general considerations -- of teachers as classroom researchers, philosophy of education, theories of learning, and the adult learner -- but always within the contexts of participants' experiences and the local (institutional) culture. The second half would invite participants to discuss and refine their papers-in-progress.

The emphases of the seminar involved several key assumptions, which were derived in part from considerations of adjunct faculty morale. They included: The extended format of the seminars, to provide faculty with much-needed time together, both to explore common concerns and to promote collegiality; the emphasis on faculty experience, to improve morale and instruction by acknowledging and building upon existing strengths and competencies; the emphasis upon the local context, to ground theory in both individual experiences and the Mission & Goals and classroom policies of the College; the idea of teacher-as-researcher, to encourage reflection on and adaptation of classroom practices and strategies; the writing requirement, to further clarify ideas and extend the discourse on teaching and

learning to all faculty: the interdisciplinary membership, to promote both collegiality and 'cross-fertilization' of techniques across disciplinary boundaries; and, finally, payment for involvement, to validate both the institution's value of adjunct faculty time outside the classroom and the function and content of the seminars themselves.

In addition to the seminar-related activities, however, project staff also encountered a lack of readily accessible information regarding faculty demographics and the question of morale. For this reason, and to more accurately place the seminars within the context of faculty morale, project staff conducted a survey, interviewing faculty and subsequently distributing a faculty-wide questionnaire on adjunct morale and faculty development.

Project Results: Adjunct Faculty Morale & a Model for Faculty Development

The faculty-wide survey on morale and faculty development revealed high morale among all faculty around certain questions, e.g., academic freedom, the College's support of work with students, and student services, while issues regarding pay were the most common sources of low morale. Opportunities for faculty development were not ranked among those as most important by any groups of faculty except seminar participants, who ranked in-house faculty development among the ten most important. A variety of additional differences of some significance among faculty groups were also noted, and the survey results, as well as the seminars, have helped to set agenda for faculty initiatives by academic staff and Faculty Association representatives.

The seminars themselves were rated highly by all participants, and primarily for those reasons embodied in the premises for the design. Participants variously noted enhanced collegiality, an appreciation for and good use of the opportunity to focus on their teaching, the value of the focus on the local context and the writing requirement, the unexpected and fruitful results of interdisciplinary exposure and cooperation, and an appreciation of the recognition signified by the honorarium. Very few negative comments about the seminars were offered, and most of those centered on the text employed.

In addition, a variety of other outcomes were welcome by project staff, including: Prospects for inter-institutional collaboration on adjunct faculty development; an extension of paid "office hour" opportunities to all faculty; despite the (possibly temporary) suspension of the seminars because of a budget deficit, a substantial increase in the fund for faculty development; the definite influence of the seminar on the design of future faculty development activities; and finally, an in-house faculty newspaper.

Summary & Conclusions: High Hopes in a Context of Limited Resources

The project on "Adjunct Faculty Morale and Faculty Development" has had a number of positive outcomes, including a workable and well-received model for (adjunct) faculty development which has resulted in increased clarity about methods and philosophy, College-wide discourse on teaching and learning, interdisciplinary collegiality and cross-fertilization, and a demonstrable difference in attitude toward in-house faculty development opportunities on the part of participants. In addition, project activities have had a direct and positive impact on the institution's approach to and attitudes toward adjunct faculty and faculty development -- including paid office hours for adjuncts and increases in fund allocations -- and a much clearer and more discriminating picture of adjunct faculty morale, which should help to establish the agenda for future faculty initiatives.

Project Overview: Adjunct Faculty Morale & Faculty Development

As with most colleges and universities, Burlington College faced the many questions accompanying the employment of adjunct faculty. But unlike most other institutions, which employ a limited, albeit increasing, number of adjuncts, Burlington College, from its beginnings in 1972, has relied entirely upon an all-adjunct faculty.

In the months preceding our preliminary proposal to FIPSE, certain of those questions were becoming acutely 'felt', particularly, questions of adjunct faculty morale and faculty development. Concerns were audible both among academic administrative staff, who are responsible for faculty development, and among the adjunct faculty themselves, who were expressing increasing frustrations with the mixed agenda of faculty gatherings, and with a sense of estrangement from one another, and of disenfranchisement from the College -- all, perhaps, best summed up, as one faculty member put it, in a sense of the faculty's "second-class status" as members of the community. Some faculty were also concerned about pay, others, about the lack of discriminating criteria in the by-laws for defining faculty -- a definition which, among other shortcomings, equated new faculty, who might only be teaching a 1-credit workshop, with faculty who'd been teaching and mentoring at the College for years. Moreover, concerns were institutionalized when a report of a recent team visit by the New England Association underscored the need to "assure a functional and effective system of governance which includes an organized and appropriate role for faculty."

These conditions were what prompted the deliberations leading up to our original FIPSE proposal. What was needed, it seemed, was something which would help, not only to take the pulse on faculty morale, but to strengthen it, something which would not only investigate possibilities for faculty development, but provide opportunities for it.

In the autumn of 1988, after considerable discussion -- among members of the academic staff, the adjunct faculty, Faculty Association representatives, and the President -- the College submitted a preliminary proposal to FIPSE to conduct a series of faculty seminars on teaching and learning. It had the general support of all concerned, and enthusiastic support from a significant number, including many of the adjuncts and their reps.

The idea was simple: Faculty seminars on "Teaching and Learning Across the Curriculum" would not only invite faculty to focus on the classroom, but draw upon the competencies and questions of the faculty participants themselves. Each seminar would run for ten consecutive meetings, with from five to ten faculty from various disciplines participating each term, thereby offering opportunities for collegiality and interdisciplinary exchange and understanding.

The first half of the seminar would focus on more general themes -- the aims of education, theories of learning, adult learners, and the notion of teachers as classroom researchers. Each of these themes, however, would be rooted in the local culture -- on the issues, problems, ideas and strategies which emerged from the participants' experiences within the local context. Each faculty participant would be also be asked to write a brief paper on "any aspect of teaching and learning" at the College, the writings providing the focus for the second half of the seminar, which would follow a writers' workshop model. At the end of each seminar, the papers would be published in-house for distribution throughout the College community. Last, though certainly not least, faculty would be paid an honorarium for their participation and the completion of their papers.

Obviously, the project was funded. Now, three years after that preliminary proposal and two years after the beginning of the project, some thirty (more than 40%) of Burlington College's all-adjunct faculty, including both veteran and new members, have participated in the seminars. Participants noted the value of the seminars -- for the opportunity it afforded to focus on teaching and learning; for the occasion it provided for examining their own teaching, both in discussions and through writing; and especially for the "opportunity to work with other B.C. faculty," including the interdisciplinary exchange and promotion of collegiality. In addition, nearly all veteran faculty participants rated the seminar very highly "in comparison with other B.C. faculty development experiences," and most said it was "the best faculty development experience" they'd had at the College.

Five editions of the collected faculty papers on "Teaching and Learning Across the Curriculum" were published, and have resulted in a wide variety of works -- including papers on designing courses for non-majors, on

clarifying teaching aims and strategies for approaching our (nearly all) "non-traditional" students, and on proposals for curricular reform. The papers, in turn, have promoted wider discourse on teaching and learning throughout the institution; and both new and long-standing faculty who participated have become involved in committee work in the College as a direct result of their participation. Finally, more so than other faculty groups, the seminar participants have come to recognize the importance of in-house faculty development.

In addition to the seminars, project staff also compiled a faculty database and, through informal interviews and an in-depth questionnaire, conducted a comprehensive survey identifying issues affecting both faculty morale and faculty development; and project activities as a whole have helped to focus the ideas and efforts of both the academic staff and the Faculty Association representatives in designing future activities for faculty development, and in addressing questions of faculty morale.

Finally, the direct result of the seminars on outcomes for students is difficult to document. Because of the College's narrative evaluation process for all learning, and because the seminars did not aim at a single or small-scale change in a particular course or program, but rather, at the entire educational culture and community, this is likely to remain true. But from the comments of both seminar participants and other faculty, as well as from the student support for faculty development as a result of the seminars, it seems more than reasonable to infer a direct and beneficial result. In addition, the papers which have come out of the seminars, promoting College-wide discourse on teaching and learning, are further support for that inference.

The results, then -- for the faculty participants themselves, as well as for the wider College community -- appear to be both significant and valuable.

Problem & Purpose: The Local Problem & the National Context

With our all-adjunct faculty, we were acutely aware of the problems facing us as we prepared our preliminary proposal. Faculty morale was low, and faculty development had become an on-going enigma. But even in the interim period, between the preliminary and the final proposals, it was becoming increasingly apparent that our problems were not merely local.

From discussions with our own adjunct faculty, many of whom also work as adjuncts at other area institutions, and from much press -- as, for example, in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, which reported variously on the formation of adjunct faculty unions, court-mandated definitions of employee status regarding adjuncts, and the more benign but telling increases in the number of "temporary" faculty -- anyone who cared to could see that the questions surrounding the employment of adjunct faculty were multiplying, and considerably more complicated than imagined.

In order to understand the problems we attempted to address, as well as the nation-wide problems concerning adjunct faculty, some history seems essential.

The Growing Use of Adjunct Faculty --

As enrollments have become more uncertain and budgets less likely to keep pace with continuing the cost of business-as-usual, many schools have become more reliant upon adjuncts as a flexible and cost-effective way to sustain the breadth and number of their offerings. Recent statistics in *The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac* [1991, pg. 30], compiled from a 1988 survey of 480 colleges and universities, show that 16% of all faculty nation-wide are "temporary part-time," with another 3% "temporary full-time." (While a footnote states that the category of temporary faculty includes "visiting, acting, and adjunct professors," it seems reasonable to infer that most, if not all, visiting and acting professors are full-time, while most temporary part-time help are adjuncts.)

In comparing both public and private 4-year and public 2-year institutions, the greatest percentage (23%) of part-time "temps" were found in the public 2-year schools, schools with the greatest degree of unpredictability in enrollments. Temporary part-timers accounted for 19% of all faculty at private 4-year institutions, while the smallest percentage (9%) were em-

ployed at public 4-year colleges and universities. Thus, as of 1988, 1 in 5 faculty at private colleges and universities and at community and technical colleges, and 1 in 10 at public 4-year institutions, were adjuncts.

The numbers today are probably higher. And Burlington College is one of a very few, but perhaps growing, number of colleges whose faculty are all adjuncts. But the situation, not only in terms of numbers, but in the very identity of these increasing numbers of adjuncts, is relatively new.

The Changing Identity of Adjuncts --

For years, many colleges and universities had relied on hiring faculty on an adjunct basis primarily for adult, continuing education courses, many of which were not degree-track courses, and often not applicable to degree requirements for the once-few students who might have subsequently "transferred" to the full-time day programs. Moreover, many "adjunct" hirings often drew upon resident faculty -- faculty who, for additional income, or for the relative pleasures of the greater diversity and informality of the evening classroom, were willing to add to their teaching loads. But over the years, all that has changed.

As the number of "non-traditional" students in daytime classes has grown, and as "evening divisions" have become increasingly degree-track oriented, the number of adjunct courses and sections also increased. But in order to meet the demand for more courses and sections -- required to maintain the viability of the variety of programs -- and to do so in the face of the uncertain enrollments which accompanied the new student demographics, adjunct hirings have not only increased, but come from outside the institution.

This new pool of adjuncts has offered cost-effectiveness and flexibility in addressing those fluctuating demands, a means for hiring only so many faculty as are needed per semester. At Burlington College, which began with fourteen students and an all-adjunct faculty in 1972, controlling the cost for instruction was and remains an essential ingredient in its ability to do business. But at Burlington College, as elsewhere, such use of adjuncts has not been without difficulties.

The Problematics of an Adjunct Work Force --

In the wider higher educational community, perhaps the first reserva-

tions concerning the hiring of adjuncts from "outside" were expressed, if not always publicly, by resident and tenured faculty. As one faculty member, a former department chair and retiree now teaching on and adjunct basis, observed, many inside faculty tended to perceive the new adjuncts as analogous to "scabs," a threat to departmental growth, or to the tenure of hopeful residents. Yet others, he noted, questioned the abilities of new adjuncts ("If they could make the grade, why are they teaching adjunct?"); and still others, perhaps more benignly, yet anticipating problems to come, questioned the wisdom of using adjuncts who were not more integrally a part of the institutional culture.

As mentioned, at Burlington College, there are no resident or tenured faculty, at least not in the usual senses of those terms, who might have raised such concerns. Yet some of the all-adjunct faculty have been teaching at the College for years -- as many as 40% for five years or more, and half of them, for nearly ten or more. Thus, for the past several years at least, a number of these longer-term faculty have begun to call for recognition as "core" or "senior" faculty, with attendant requests which have ranged from guaranteed courses, to fringe benefits, to preferential consideration for course proposals and a pay-scale differential based on years of service. Even many newer adjuncts were dismayed that they would be paid no more for teaching after several years of service than new adjuncts just coming on.

Such concerns may have moderated recently in light of limited growth. But even as more faculty nationwide (and more of us altogether) have come to realize that we have to find ways of doing more with less, and as the presence of adjuncts from "outside" the institution has become an established fact of doing business, there remain other difficulties associated with the increasing reliance upon adjuncts -- difficulties which appear to be inherent in the new and defining characteristics of today's adjuncts.

Adjunct Faculty Morale & Faculty Development --

If the time has passed when "adjunct" meant primarily the additional teaching load of resident faculty, questions of faculty morale, common enough among resident faculty, are exacerbated by adjunct status. The lack of a sense of connection and the lack of institutional acknowledgement and benefits are only two of the many problems often associated with low morale

among adjuncts. But faculty development -- a once taken-for-granted fact of faculty status, "part of the job" -- presents notorious difficulties when it comes to adjuncts, who are, by definition, temporary, and who, in most cases, have been hired to do a much more circumscribed job.

The problem of faculty development is further complicated by the now-growing awareness that it may not be in the best interests -- either of the students, the institution, or the faculty themselves -- if such development is taken too narrowly. The traditional pressures upon faculty to attract research grants and to "publish or perish" is increasingly being viewed as detracting from the primary mission of teaching and learning. But even if resident and tenured faculty are able to turn the corner on this issue and focus more of their energies and research on issues of teaching and learning, it is unlikely that adjuncts will reap the benefits. And the institutions, which were attracted to the increasing use of outside adjuncts in order to more effectively control the costs of instruction in the face of uncertain enrollments, are unlikely to allocate the funds necessary to insure a viable and productive program of faculty development for adjuncts.

The irony in all this is obvious. Adjuncts are not hired to attract research dollars or to publish scholarly papers in their fields, but first and foremost, to teach. Yet this fast-growing teaching force, structurally marginalized in a very tenuous affiliation, is the least likely to benefit from the kinds of faculty privileges usually associated with improvements in teaching ability, including expense-paid faculty development activities and the cherished faculty sabbatical.

In circumstances such as these, eventually, even the adjuncts, many of whom are interested in full-time positions but find themselves locked out by market glut and a recession economy, begin to question their status and use. As one adjunct put it, "Sometimes I think we're nothing more than the migrant workers of higher education."

Background & Origins: The Local Context in Detail

As noted earlier, if these problems present difficulties for colleges and universities employing increasing numbers of adjuncts, they are even more pressing at Burlington College, which has always relied entirely upon an all-adjunct faculty. With no resident or tenured faculty (even the President teaches on an adjunct basis), and with the College's adjuncts responsible for all teaching and upper-level advisement, the difficulties of faculty morale and faculty development are critical.

Faculty paid only to teach a course cannot be expected to take on the additional work -- of governance, curriculum development, or even office hours. And faculty who come only to teach a class, or to attend the occasional faculty meeting or workshop, cannot readily become an integral part of the College community. Moreover, even when faculty development may be attractive, it is a difficult case to make, that faculty -- without residence, tenure, or benefits, and often with other jobs -- should spend additional hours without compensation in order to become better teachers.

The Immediate Context for the Project --

In the two or so years immediately preceding the preliminary proposal, it had become increasingly apparent that faculty morale was in decline and, moreover, that faculty development, an on-going difficulty, was in danger of becoming extinct. At faculty meetings, which themselves had wavered between being a colloquy for pedagogy and a forum for politics, attendance had become erratic; and discussions often reflected that mixed agenda. While most faculty seemed interested in both the pedagogy and the politics and called for clarity about the purposes of particular meetings, tension between faculty who pushed for the political agenda and those who insisted on sticking to the business of teaching became apparent. So, too, did the fact that some faculty viewed some administrative staff (and in some cases, the President) as unsympathetic to faculty concerns.

Finally, to add a sense of urgency, a visiting team from the regional accrediting association had presented the College with a finding which underscored the paradoxical nature of one of the problems most commonly associated with adjunct faculty. While the team had noted that the College needed "to assure a functional and effective system of governance which

includes *an organized and appropriate role for faculty*," [Italics added.] at the same time, it noted "the difficulties" in "finding faculty who are ... available to assume the time consuming task of participating in the committee work associated with academic governance."

The Early History: Community & Commitment --

Since 1972, when Burlington College first opened its doors, the aim has been to serve the (then) non-traditional student through "individualized" degree programs. For all courses and other learning activities, as well as for upper-level mentoring (begun with the introduction of the 4-year program in 1975), it has relied entirely on its all-adjunct faculty -- with all the attendant benefits and drawbacks of all that implies.

With fourteen students that first year, and an institutional policy to limit class size to no more than 20 students, it was not feasible to hire a salaried faculty to provide the breadth of courses and other learning activities to support a liberal arts curriculum. Several administrative staff provided the necessary entry-level advising, financial aid, and other services. Most also taught, on an adjunct basis, i.e., without guarantees. Faculty were paid (and continue to be) on a per student basis. On the other hand, neither the faculty nor any aspects of the institution were "entrenched." There were no departments vying for limited resources, no discipline-specific programs to support, and no large plant facilities straining the budget. Obviously, there were also no resident or tenured faculty to regard the use of adjuncts with suspicion.

The staff and faculty were there primarily because they believed in the College's Mission & Goals. They were enthusiastic about the diversity of the student body. They understood, too, that most of these adult, "non-traditional" students were in school, not because it was required or expected of them, but because they wanted to be there. Moreover, many of the all-adjunct faculty were primarily practitioners in their fields, enthusiastic also about making their work and the ideas behind it intelligible to these students. Add to this the College's cost-free use of existing community space to hold classes, its emphases upon "community involvement," upon classroom discussion vs. lecture, and upon "shared responsibility" between faculty and students, including mutual (narrative) evaluation of student work, and one can begin to get a feel for this College and its culture

which -- very different for the time, and in many ways still -- was out to make a difference.

This situation -- of an adjunct hiring policy which helped to provide necessary fiscal controls on expenditures and to make possible a diverse program of offerings, and a culture which promoted a strong sense of and commitment to the College community and its Mission & Goals -- made it possible for the College to grow, and to attract both students and faculty alike. It should also be noted, however, that faculty in those earlier years, unlike those who were willing to take on the more time-consuming tasks of administration, were, for the time and the higher education neighborhood, paid fairly well. While the fact that they were paid on a per-student basis directly linked instructional expenses to income, nonetheless, roughly half of student tuition was paid out in turn to the all-adjunct faculty who taught them.

Thus -- along with the College's emphases on the dignity and shared responsibility of each student, on keeping its "individualized" degree programs financially accessible, and on the community involvement of both its students and faculty -- the fact that the faculty enjoyed their work, were committed to the Mission & Goals of the College, and were paid relatively well, all contributed to an atmosphere which continued to attract increasing numbers of students and faculty for the next fifteen or more years. But those years have not been without difficulties.

A Limit to Growth? --

Today, current enrollment numbers approximately 200. As the number of students increased, so did the number of faculty, as well as the number of administrative staff, structures, and policies.

More and more, faculty only rarely gathered together informally to "talk shop." Faculty meetings, which began as a three-per-semester requirement in the late Seventies in response to the need for more formal faculty development, increasingly offered only enough time for faculty to meet and introduce themselves to one another, and to be informed about the growing number of administrative requirements incumbent upon them. Despite efforts prior to the FIPSE project to boost attendance at faculty development activities -- with changes in format, focus and tone -- attendance was erratic, and often remained quite low.

The greater formalities which the faculty faced, while understandable in the context of institutional growth, were not always afforded the litmus test of faculty approval, adding to the dissatisfaction among some faculty. Until the quite recent formation of the Faculty Association (F.A.) with its four elected representatives, there was, in fact, no formal faculty body to approach; and a full-scale survey of all faculty on all changes would have been an administrative nightmare. But even with the formation of the F.A., changes were not always presented for approval prior to implementation. This was probably no more than a matter of formalized procedures lagging behind the formation of yet another "committee" (a hallmark trait of organizations in the early stages of institutionalization). But this was seen by some adjuncts, including some F.A. reps, as unapproved "changes in working conditions," and prompted an invitation to representatives of a newly-forming state-wide adjunct faculty union to come and speak at a faculty retreat during the second year of the project.

Moreover, in the early '80s the College acquired property in an effort to gain control of rapidly increasing expenses for rents -- not only for administrative offices, but for the once-free classroom space it had enjoyed for nearly ten years. Tuition, too, increased steadily, if at first reluctantly given the institutional goal of keeping programs "financially accessible"; and this, at a time when federal student grants and loans were not keeping pace with inflation. And finally, faculty pay, which had been roughly half of tuition revenue in 1972, had dropped to around 20% of total tuition revenues by 1988.

Thus, the relative success of increasing numbers of students brought with it the strain of inflation on limited resources and growing costs for administrative staff and plant facilities. Given the College's heavy reliance on tuition income to cover expenses, and despite the direct link between tuition income and instructional expense, these increasing costs of doing business combined to make conscious the question of whether there was a point at which the College could no longer afford to provide the "individualized" education which is at the heart of its educational Mission.

Despite these changes, however, Burlington College remains relatively small, and that has certainly helped -- to identify problems, including their context and history, and to attempt solutions with broad impact.

Project Description: Adjunct Faculty Morale & Faculty Development

The project began officially on 15 August 1989, with a half-time project director and a 2/5ths-time administrative assistant, both of whom were already well-acquainted with most staff and faculty. Within weeks, all academic and administrative staff were aware of the project, as well as all faculty. Moreover, there was broad support among most members of all constituencies within the College, from the outset and throughout the funding period [15 August 1989-14 August 1991].

In addition, the small size of the College made it possible, not only to communicate with staff and faculty about project activities, but to "interview" a number of faculty and staff informally. Project staff also reviewed documents pertinent to the "Problem & Purpose" and "Background & Origins" sections of this report, compiled a faculty database, canvassed other area institutions about practice and policy regarding adjuncts, and conducted a faculty-wide questionnaire survey on faculty morale and faculty development.

Original Design -- "Teaching & Learning Across the Curriculum"

The FIPSE project proposal was originally designed to address the problems of both adjunct faculty morale and faculty development through a series of faculty development seminars. While the project was never intended as a "solution" to the problem of adjunct faculty morale, many features of the design were a direct result of that consideration. Thus, the project proposed a model for faculty development -- a series of extended faculty seminars on "Teaching and Learning Across the Curriculum" -- to improve both morale and the quality of education.

The project aimed at 30-40 participants (roughly half of the all-adjunct faculty) over a two year period, each of whom would be paid a $500 honorarium for participation, and for completion of a paper on "any aspect of teaching and learning" derived from their experiences at the College. Since the College serves primarily older students (the average age is about 30), it was also assumed that most papers would reflect the peculiarities of working with adult, "non-traditional" students.

Structured as ten consecutive, two-hour meetings, the first five sessions invited faculty to discuss and examine their teaching experiences

within several broad contexts -- teacher-as-researcher, the aims of education, theories of learning, and the adult learner -- each of which was to draw, not from general theory alone, but from local context and culture. The last five sessions would focus upon the development of the papers, beginning with questions of purpose and audience, and followed by four sessions employing a "writers' workshop" model, during which faculty would have an opportunity to present early drafts for discussion and comment.

Lastly, the final papers would be collected and published in-house for distribution to all faculty, with additional copies circulated throughout the College community (e.g., in the library, in the student lounge, outside offices, etc.).

Key Assumptions --

The seminar design was built upon several key assumptions:

The extended format of the seminars: Many faculty, including the most senior and committed among them, had expressed their frustration that the usual 90-minute faculty meetings and workshops offered insufficient time to engage in productive dialogue, either about the issues of teaching or of the political agenda of faculty. In addition, other faculty, particularly newer faculty, had expressed their sense of estrangement, both from their colleagues and from the College community as a whole. The extended format of the seminars was intended to address these concerns, and to result both in more opportunities for productive dialogue on teaching and learning, and in greater collegiality.

The emphasis on faculty experience: Early discussions had brought up the possibility of bringing in "outside" educators to offer workshops for faculty. But two short-comings seemed inherent in this approach. First, it would not provide the extended time faculty were seeking. But more, the thought was that an emphasis on the experience of the faculty would improve morale and instruction by acknowledging and building upon already-existing strengths and competencies. Moreover -- just as in the classrooms of the College -- the focus of discussions would be grounded in, and shaped and developed by, the interests, needs and experiences of the participants, and not solely by the materials, design and intentions of the instructor.

The emphasis upon the local context: Closely tied to the emphasis on the experience of the College's faculty is the emphasis on the local context and culture. While ideas and strategies of value can emerge from general theory, and while more generic readings were included, emphasis upon local context and culture would permit us to focus on educational philosophy, learning theory, etc., as it is encountered in the local experiences of the faculty, as well as in the Mission & Goals of the College. In this way, faculty experience would become the source and litmus test of ideas, but also, the subject of discussions (and writings) which would help to expose the theoretical assumptions informing practice. This approach was intended, then, both to anchor theory by reference to practice, and to strengthen the sense of shared purpose, philosophy, and community

The idea of teacher-as-researcher: This idea obviously combines the emphases upon faculty experience and local context, but takes them a step further. By asking faculty to focus upon their experiences, within the local context and in the extended format of the seminar, they would not be simply in a position to talk shop and share anecdotes, but to reflect upon practice. By comparing notes -- with one another, and with ideas of the philosophy, learning theory and culture inherent in the Mission & Goals -- and by being invited to speculate -- about how students learn (or not), and about how practices or strategies affect student learning -- faculty would have an opportunity to focus on their students and their own teaching practices with the same sort of inquiring eye of research which they bring to explorations within their own disciplines. Such reflection on practice, in the context of a group effort, would also strengthen a common faculty identity, of being, first and foremost, teachers.

The writing requirement: The requirement of the paper at the end of the seminar had a two-fold purpose. By drawing upon the work of writing-across-the-curriculum, the emphasis on the writing process would permit faculty to use their writing, not simply as a medium in which to present ideas, but as a tool for exploring, focusing upon, and clarifying those ideas -- an experience, we suspected, which might also find its way into their classroom practices. On the other hand the publication and distribu-

tion of the finished papers in-house would extend the focus and field of discourse on teaching and learning among more faculty and throughout the College.

The interdisciplinary membership: With the limited number of faculty in many areas of the curriculum, it would have been impractical to conduct discipline-specific seminars at Burlington College. But the aim of interdisciplinary participation in each of the seminars had a positive focus. First, it would allow for greater collegiality among all faculty. But more importantly, it would allow for the development of mutual understanding across disciplinary lines, exposing something of the integrity of the curriculum, and promoting a kind of "cross- fertilization" of teaching methods and materials from which both faculty and students might benefit.

Payment for involvement: While most of us would like to imagine ourselves more or less selflessly pursuing the stuff our professional dreams are made of, one certain aim of the seminars was that we not expect adjunct faculty -- many of whom hold full- or part-time jobs elsewhere, including other adjunct employment -- to participate, particularly given the kind of time the seminars would require, without some sort of compensation. Thus, while the use of adjuncts admittedly may be the result of cost-effective considerations, the honorarium seemed essential, and still less costly than the additional costs commonly associated with resident and tenured faculty.

Project Activities --

These were the premises upon which the faculty seminars were built -- guiding premises which project staff sought to translate into activities and test in application. The project director and administrative assistant set to work immediately on getting the word out and laying the groundwork for as smooth an operation as possible. We met with other administrative staff -- including, of course, the academic staff (three of the four of whom participated), but also with the President (who eventually 'took' one of the seminars), Business Office staff (to personally set up procedures for fund accounting, contracts and disbursement of the honoraria), and the Registrar (to schedule meeting space). Staff also met with the Faculty Association representatives, as well as the majority of the adjuncts teach-

ing that first semester, and put together the first faculty-wide mailing inviting adjuncts to join us for the first seminar.

The first and subsequent mailings included a brief description of the project and its aims. A copy of the proposed seminar "course description" (a common frame of reference at the College for all courses, containing the "Goals, Activities, and Grounds & Means of Evaluation"), along with a one-page "Syllabus". In addition, a request for proposal of a topic for the paper was included. [Copies of these materials appear in the Appendices/ "Seminar Materials."] But faculty were informed that they need not have a specific topic or theme for their papers, and that would not affect selection for the limited number of slots. They were informed, however, that if there were fewer slots than applicants, preference would be given to the greatest possible interdisciplinary diversity. (In fact, certain faculty were specifically targeted because of their disciplines, particularly in math and the sciences, where numbers are proportionally fewer.)

The ten-week seminar schedule was set to begin two weeks after the beginning of the semester, and to end two weeks prior to the end of the semester, in order to allow faculty who were concurrently teaching to get their courses going and to end them with enough time and space to attend to the last details, including the narrative evaluations they must write for each student.

Faculty response was enthusiastic, but scheduling difficulties that first semester, compounded by our relatively late start-up date, resulted in only five, albeit eager and energetic, participants. Scheduling difficulties continued to keep some interested faculty from participating, even though we tried to vary the times of day and days of the week when the seminar was offered, and despite a significant change from the ten consecutive meeting format to include all-day sessions in seminars from the Summer 1990 semester on. The latter, while not dictated by scheduling considerations alone, actually made it possible for some to participate, but also kept others from doing so.

In any event, the three seminars the first year attracted 20 faculty participants, with an additional 12 in the two seminars conducted during the second year. For each seminar, invitations were mailed, omitting faculty who had already participated. But as the project continued, more and more faculty initiated inquiries about participating on their own.

All this was expected, part of the original FIPSE proposal. But even at the outset, once the hurry of getting the first seminar underway was behind us, we were beginning to see that the work before us was more than we'd originally anticipated.

As with many experiments, in keeping with Murphy's Laws, some of the first steps which took us beyond the assumptions of the seminars themselves brought us to dead ends. For one thing, it became immediately apparent that there were no readily accessible or comprehensive sources of information about the faculty. This is not meant to disparage. But the fact is, as a relatively new institution, Burlington College continually encounters new demands for tracking its history, the need to develop and expand its sources and records of information. And since the adjunct faculty have always been independent contractors, not employees, it stands to reason that, as a group, the information concerning them would not have has as high a priority for tracking. Thus, even what we'd imagined (without really stopping to think about it) as simple tasks -- such as discovering how many years faculty had been teaching at the College, or information about faculty turnover, or the number of faculty teaching in different areas of the curriculum -- required that project staff begin to compile a faculty database from printed sources such as old course listings.

In addition to such basic information, however, project staff also recognized early on the need to get at some clearer sense of faculty morale, both for its own sake, and to place the value of the seminars in the wider context of morale. While many faculty and administrative staff had a sense of low faculty morale and could identify various symptoms (with more or less specificity, if not unanimity), no formal assessment of morale had been conducted prior to the beginning of the project. For this reason, both informal interviews with faculty and a subsequent faculty-wide questionnaire survey were employed.

The Interviews --

Informal interviews, ranging anywhere from 5 minutes to more than an hour, were held with roughly three-quarters of the adjuncts during the course of the project. Most took place with individuals, but occasionally, faculty were interviewed in small groups, as, for example, were all seminar

participants for a portion of the last session each semester, though half of them were also interviewed again in subsequent individual sessions.

The aim of the interviews was primarily to see 'what was up', meaning that we let the faculty dictate the course of the conversation and simply recorded what they'd talked about. It should be noted that the context of many of the interviews beyond the seminars was nothing more than the usual opportunity most staff -- who, unlike most adjuncts, are at the College regularly -- have to talk with faculty. On occasion, some faculty might be asked, "As far as 'faculty morale', what adds to it and what detracts from it for you?" That was usually more than sufficient to get the conversation going.

Evaluation & Questionnaire -- Contents & Methods

The comments gleaned from these interviews, in as near verbatim a form as possible, appeared as 41 items on a faculty-wide questionnaire survey, which, along with a post-seminar evaluation, was one of two instruments used to assess faculty morale and the success of the seminars.

All faculty seminar participants (32/100%) completed a post-seminar evaluation. Of the 67 questionnaires distributed in the faculty-wide survey, 53 were completed and returned, a response rate of nearly 80% (2 were excluded from figures used herein because of late receipt). Faculty identity on questionnaires was optional; 6 were received anonymously. Consequently, only 25 of the seminar participants were able to be identified.

Numerical rating scales on both the post-seminar evaluation and the questionnaire survey were identical. For all rated items, faculty were asked to indicate a rating on a 1 (low) - 6 (high) scale. An even numbered scale was used to discourage use of a median rating. Faculty were asked to rate each item at the whole number; not all respondents rated all items.

The Post-Seminar Evaluation --

All faculty participants in the seminars were asked to complete the post-seminar evaluation at the final session. Part 1 asked faculty to rate the seminar on the basis of subjective assessment on eight separate qualitative questions, followed by four open-ended items calling for narrative response:

1. On a scale of 1 (low) to 6 (high), please rate the seminar on the following:

   a. For its quality as a faculty development experience.
   b. For its clarity of purpose (re: course description).
   c. For its interdisciplinary value.
   d. On how well it was structured (re: syllabus).
   e. On how well it was 'run' (re: Director's role).
   f. On the quality of the text (re: Eble).
   g. As an opportunity to work with other B.C. faculty.
   h. In relation to other B.C. faculty development experiences.

2. What did you like best about the seminar?
3. What did you like least about the seminar?
4. Would you recommend the seminar to other faculty? yes/no. Why?
5. Other comments.

The post-seminar evaluation form, along with a table of all rated responses and a listing of all narrative responses, appears in the Appendices ["The Seminar: Participant Demographics & the Post-Seminar Evaluation"].

The Questionnaire on Faculty Morale & Faculty Development --

The questionnaire on faculty morale and faculty development consisted of four pages: Page 1 focused on demographic items, including name (optional), degrees, teaching experience, committee work, and staff experience. Page 2 -- from which most of the material used in this report was drawn -- asked for separate subjective ratings on both "importance" and "satisfaction" to the forty-one items related to faculty morale and faculty development gleaned from the previous interviews . The items presented covered diverse areas, including: Student skills and performance, support and accessibility of administrative staff, academic freedom, governance, opportunities for faculty development, teaching facilities & resources, information exchange and communication, general working conditions and pay.

1. The process for proposing/selecting courses and workshops?
2. General working conditions?
3. Faculty orientation?
4. Opportunities for involvement beyond teaching?
5. Class size?
6. Integrity of the curriculum?
7. Opportunities to teach what you want?
8. Teaching resources (a-v and other teaching aids)?
9. Pay for courses and workshops?

10. Support services to students? (tutoring, skills, etc.)
11. Academic freedom?
12. Meaningful participation in the B.C. community?
13. Administrative or secretarial support for teaching tasks?
14. Diversity of the student body?
15. Classroom space(s) and other teaching facilities?
16. Process for evaluation of faculty performance?
17. Mentoring process and structure?
18. Variety of learning modes? (workshops, GIS, tutorials, etc.)
19. Pay for courses & workshops on a per student basis?
20. Opportunities for in-house faculty development?
21. General flow and exchange of information concerning faculty?
22. Scheduling options for teaching?
23. General academic skill level of students?
24. Accessibility of college administrative staff?
25. Standards of evaluation for student performance?
26. General support from college in your work with students?
27. Fifteen week Fall & Spring semester scheduling options?
28. Opportunities for faculty development outside B.C.?
29. Quality of upper-level student work?
30. Effective voice in governance issues regarding faculty?
31. Clear lines of communication for teaching-related issues?
32. Clear lines of communication for other faculty issues?
33. Adequacy of basic skills level of students?
34. Summer (8-week) semester scheduling options?
35. Effective voice in curriculum matters?
36. Compensation for committee and other non-teaching service?
37. Narrative evaluation process (of students)?
38. Faculty Association representation?
39. Fringe benefits for adjunct faculty?
40. B.C. recognition of teaching accomplishments?
41. Pay raises for length/years of B.C. teaching experience?

Page 3 included a variety of items, beginning with two open-ended narrative questions asking faculty what they like "most" and "least" about teaching at the College. For the latter, faculty were also asked what they would "suggest to remedy the situation(s)" identified. The next item asked faculty to list their "top three" choices (in order of importance) if they could "set the agenda for faculty initiatives." The last section on this page asked faculty with other post-secondary teaching experience to rate their adjunct experience at the College in comparison -- on the bases of pay, general working conditions, accessibility and voice in faculty issues, academic freedom, and the standards and quality of student work. Page 4, entitled "Open Forum," was intended for "any additional comments, or to elaborate on... previous responses."

As of this writing, responses to the 41 rated items constitute the majority of the material used in the quantitative analysis of results on

questions of faculty morale. Responses to these rated items were examined for all faculty (N=51), and for sub-groups of seminar faculty (n=25), non-seminar faculty (n=26), faculty with five or more years at the College (n=19), and "new" faculty with two or fewer years (n=22).

Because it was clear that ratings were skewed toward the upper end of the rating scale for all groups, standard deviations as well as mean ratings were run for all items and for all faculty and sub-groups. Consequently, rankings, and not mean ratings, have been used in order to more accurately compare responses for all respondents and for all sub-groupings. Rankings used the mean rating (descending) as the first order determinant and the standard deviation (ascending) as the second order determinant.

A copy of the questionnaire and complete lists of rankings of all items for all groups appear in the Appendices ["Faculty-Wide Questionnaire Survey & Results"].

Project Results: Adjunct Faculty Morale & a Model for Faculty Development

In the words of a Canadian author of some renown, "For creatures, there is never anything which runs unmingled." That seems an apt enough description of the "results" of this project.

As far as the seminar itself is concerned, the results were, as will be shown, very encouraging. Faculty participants rated the seminars highly on the post-seminar evaluation, and often for precisely those reasons noted as the premises upon which the seminars were designed. All veteran faculty participants also rated the seminar as one of the best faculty development experiences they'd had, at the College or elsewhere; and most of them, as unqualifiedly the best. On a separate questionnaire survey of all faculty, participants also far out-paced their colleagues in their recognition of the importance of in-house faculty development. Even students responded favorably. In a school-wide survey of all students conducted by members of Student Activities at the beginning of the second year of the project, students chose "faculty development" as their "highest priority" for institutional support.

While all this strengthens the case for the positive influence of the seminars on "teaching and learning," as well as on faculty morale, the mingling comes from the disappointing fact that the seminars were not being continued by the College at the expiration of FIPSE funding. Thus, while the academic staff and the Faculty Association representatives have drawn heavily upon the seminar design and its premises in planning for future faculty development activities, and while the current fund for faculty development is substantially higher than it had been prior to the project, targeting of funds for limited continuation of the seminars was abandoned after a drop in student enrollments resulted in a no-growth budget for the subsequent fiscal year.

Sources --

The sources for results of project activities are comprised primarily of comments made during the seminars and informal interviews, and both narrative and quantitative responses to the post-seminar evaluation and the faculty-wide questionnaire survey.

Developments & Outcomes --

The results are presented below on the two major areas of project activities -- the faculty development seminars and the broader question of adjunct faculty morale. The section on the seminars follows the premises of the "Key Assumptions" upon which the seminars were designed, outlined in the preceding section. The material, drawn from the seminar proceedings themselves and the post-seminar evaluation, notes changes in approach, as well as findings. The section on faculty morale is derived primarily from the rated responses to the second section of the faculty-wide questionnaire survey, from comments of seminar participants, and from interviews with additional faculty.

It should be kept in mind that while the seminars may have applicability beyond the local context, and perhaps beyond the context of adjunct faculty, within that context they are closely tied to questions of faculty morale. For that reason, findings concerning morale are presented first.

Adjunct Faculty Morale --

In discussions with adjunct faculty, both during the seminars and in informal interviews, the distinct impression was that morale was not an all-or-nothing matter. For some faculty, certain aspects of adjunct working conditions were sources of extreme dissatisfaction, while in general the faculty member may have been otherwise very positive. In other cases, both the sources and level of dissatisfaction appeared to be more pervasive, while in still others, faculty expressed little or no dissatisfaction at all. Compared with other, normal human contexts, nothing of that seems particularly unusual; but in a context of assessing morale, where the tendency is to view it as something more homogeneous, it is probably good to keep such differences in mind.

Among the generally positive assessments, many faculty expressed a strong commitment to the College, and many of them wondered aloud about how better to "get the word out" to the wider community -- about the College and what it had to offer. Many had also been teaching at the College for a few years or more, and expressed "every intention of continuing" to do so. There was also strong and positive opinion regarding the value and integrity of the Mission & Goals of the College. And many faculty, as well as

administrative staff, were quick to refer to the Mission & Goals in the context of their concerns -- often, as the recognized institutional charter and standard against which those concerns ought to be measured and tested. Nonetheless, throughout the project period, faculty concerns were voiced, by a variety of faculty, about a variety of issues. These concerns included issues of governance and representation, pay structures, faculty development, student skills and performance, scheduling options, procedures for course selection, and others.

As noted, in order to gain a clearer perspective on these issues, and to get at a sense of the disparity between expectations and satisfaction, the faculty-wide questionnaire survey incorporated, nearly verbatim, a number of the concerns expressed by faculty during interviews, and then asked all faculty to rate them separately on "importance" and "satisfaction." While there was no expectation that the results would yield absolute values for these questions, the aim was to get at some sense of the hierarchies of each, and to see where the greatest gaps might be -- among faculty-at-large, and in comparisons of new faculty vs. 5+-year veterans, and seminar participants vs. others.

What's Most Important? --

For all faculty as well as for all sub-groups, one item ranked first consistently as most important: "**Academic freedom.**" Closely allied to this was the question of "**opportunities to teach what you want,**" which ranked 2nd or 3rd for all groups except 5-year faculty, for whom it ranked 10th. Both these aspects were borne out by comments from faculty, who found either the (negative) lack of "institutional snooping" or (positive) "acceptance of a lot of experimentation and diversity" to be among the most attractive aspects of teaching at the College.

The only other item which ranked among the top five in importance for all groups was "**integrity of the curriculum**" (range: 2nd-4th). Here, many faculty commented on either their appreciation of this integrity, usually referring to the interdisciplinary emphasis of many offerings, or on the sense that it was something which needed attention and revision.

Other items which appeared consistently among the top ten rankings on importance for all groups included **four student-centered items** -- "support services to students," "standards of evaluation for student performance,"

"general support from college in your work with students," and "quality of upper-level student work." All these were confirmed by comments: Faculty appreciated both academic staff, who are responsible, among other things, as primary faculty liaisons for adjuncts, and the staff of the Educational Resources Center, which provides tutoring and counseling services to students. In addition, most faculty commented on both the superior quality of some (or even much) student work, while also expressing concern about student skills or the importance of "quality work in order to graduate."

"**Class size**" (re: the policy limit of 20 students per course) was also ranked highly among all groups (6th-11th) except new faculty, for whom it ranked 29th. "**Diversity of the student body**" consistently ranked among the top third (9th-14th), again excepting new faculty, for whom it ranked slightly lower (17th). Both these aspects are closely tied to the Mission & Goals of the College, and it probably should not be surprising that it was veteran faculty who most consistently contrasted with new faculty on these questions. Many faculty veterans commented on their preference for smaller classes, as well as their appreciation for the variety of students.

On the other hand, only new faculty ranked the "**process for evaluation of faculty performance**" as relatively important (12th). Seminar and non-seminar faculty ranked it near the mean (17th & 20th), while 5-year faculty placed it among the least important items (29th), sometimes commenting on their recognition that "it's necessary, but not very useful" to them.

On the items regarding **pay**: "Pay for courses and workshops" ranked among the top ten for all groups (5th-9th) except 5-year faculty, whose rankings placed it somewhat lower (13th). And only for new faculty did "pay raises for length/years of B.C. teaching experience" place it among the top ten, while 5-year faculty rated it just above the lowest third (27th), along with the importance of "fringe benefits" (26th).

With regard to **faculty development**, "opportunities for faculty development outside B.C." ranked among the bottom eight for all groups (34th-37th). But on "opportunities for in-house faculty development," seminar participants were the only sub-group who placed it among the top ten (10th), while non-seminar faculty placed it among the bottom ten (32nd); 5-year and new faculty rankings placed it at or near the mean for those groups.

Among the **consistently lowest rankings on importance** for all groups,

"opportunities for involvement beyond teaching" ranked among the bottom four (38th-41st), and "Faculty Association representation," among the bottom five (37th-40th).

One final item did not appear among those presented for ratings -- the question of **"core" or "senior" faculty**, which had come up numerous times in informal interviews, with opinions both pro and con. But more to the point, two considerations suggested that it not be included in the survey: First, how faculty were defining "core" faculty varied considerably. For some, it meant something more or less synonymous with "senior" faculty, i.e., those who had served for some minimum number of years. For others, "core" had nothing to do with seniority, but meant the establishment of a select group of faculty within each program area within the curriculum. This lack of common meaning would have invited responses to a too-ill defined idea. But more importantly, the F.A. reps had put together and distributed a faculty-wide questionnaire on precisely this question only months before the project survey. Both reinforced the decision to exclude it from the project survey, although the expectation was that, if it was a sufficiently important issue, it would appear among the open items of the survey. Unfortunately, those items have yet to be reviewed and correlated as of this writing. But if the frequency with which this issue arose in the seminars and interviews is any indication of its importance, it seems highly likely that it will emerge from the survey results, as well.

What's Most Satisfying? --

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the rankings on satisfaction stems from the fact that, **of the top ten rankings on importance for all faculty, five were also included as among the most satisfying**: "academic freedom," "opportunities to teach what you want," "support services to students," "general support from the college in your work with students," and "class size." As noted in the preceding section, faculty comments also supported this finding. From this, it would seem reasonable to assume that these aspects of working conditions for adjuncts at the College are sources of high faculty morale.

Among other items ranked as most satisfying for all groups, "**variety of learning modes,**" -- which includes, in addition to courses, workshops, guided and independent studies, tutorials -- ranked among the four most

satisfying aspects for all groups. Here, too, comments supported this finding, with many faculty enthusiastic about both the workshop and guided independent study options, among others.

Other aspects consistently ranked among the ten most satisfying by all groups included "**diversity of the student body,**" ranked 1st by new faculty and 6th or 7th by other groups, and "**scheduling options for teaching**" (7th-9th). "Accessibility of college administrative staff" ranked among the top ten for all groups except 5-year faculty, who ranked it slightly lower (12th). No other items were ranked consistently on satisfaction at the upper end (top one-third) of the scale.

Among the items consistently appearing among the **least satisfying** (bottom ten) for all groups was the "**general flow and exchange of information concerning faculty**" (35th-36th). Many faculty commented on the lack of regular contact being "reinforced by the lack of information," resulting in "not just a general lack of awareness, but not knowing about changes that affect my teaching or pay." Most faculty did acknowledge the flow of information through in-house mail, but also found it to be "a source of more confusion than clarity" given the amount. In addition, faculty not teaching during a particular felt "outside the loop," and nearly all said they were "unable to keep up" with the amount of information and wondered if there wasn't "some way to screen what's necessary from what's interesting or not."

All items regarding **pay** but one were also ranked among the ten least satisfying aspects of adjunct work at the College, including: "pay for courses and workshops" (33rd-40th); "pay raises for length/years of B.C. teaching experience" (38th-41st); and "fringe benefits for adjunct faculty" (40th-41st). "Compensation for committee and other non-teaching service" was ranked among the bottom ten (36th-38th) by all groups except new faculty (25th). The concerns around pay were certainly borne out by numerous comments, but what may be more interesting is the fact that, while not all pay issues were ranked as particularly important by all faculty, they did show up consistently among the items revealing the greatest gaps between importance and satisfaction, q.v., below.

Only one other item was ranked among those least satisfying by all groups, "**effective voice in governance issues regarding faculty**" (31st-33rd). This seems especially peculiar given the low ranking of Faculty

Association representation, noted above. But what it implies is difficult to determine at this point, either from questionnaire results or comments.

Of the **satisfaction with other items ranked among the most important**, rankings varied widely. Satisfaction with the "integrity of the curriculum" ranked at opposite ends of the spectrum for 5-year and new faculty (9th & 28th, respectively); non-seminar faculty also ranked it more highly (11th), while seminar faculty ranked it at the mean for that group (21st). Satisfaction with "standards of evaluation for student performance" placed it among the top third for new and non-seminar faculty (14th & 13th), but only at or near the mean for the 5-year and seminar groups (21st & 17th). "Quality of upper-level student work" was ranked within the middle third by all groups (16th-25th).

Finally, on the two items regarding **faculty development** -- "opportunities for faculty development outside B.C." and "opportunities for in-house faculty development" -- both consistently ranked among the least satisfying. Opportunities for development activities "outside" the College were ranked among the lowest five (37th-39th), and "in-house" opportunities were ranked below the mean (24th-31st) by all groups, including seminar participants, who both ranked and rated it lower than other groups.

The Gaps between Importance & Satisfaction --

While the relative rankings of items on importance and satisfaction are indices in their own right, it is the difference between the two which can most accurately reflect those issues affecting faculty morale. The basic assumption is, the greater the gap, i.e., the disparity between importance and satisfaction, the more problematic the issue. With one prominent exception, there appears to be less uniformity among groups on this measure than on the separate rankings of importance or satisfaction.

The prominent exception was **pay**. Among all groups, it was the items on teaching-related pay which occupied three of the top four slots reflecting the greatest gaps between importance and satisfaction. In fact, three items -- "pay for courses and workshops," "fringe benefits for adjunct faculty," and "pay raises for length/years of B.C. teaching experience" -- reflected the three greatest gaps for all groups except seminar participants, for whom the gap regarding "adequacy of basic skills level of students" placed it 3rd (5th-10th for other groups). "Pay for courses and

workshops on a per student basis," while not ranked highly by all groups on importance, showed a more significant gap for new and non-seminar faculty (6th & 5th) vs. 5-year and seminar faculty (14th & 13th). Likewise, "compensation for committee and other non-teaching service" also revealed large gaps. The gap for both seminar and non-seminar groups placed it among the ten greatest (7th & 9th), while for 5-year and new faculty it placed among the upper third (11th & 14th).

The "**general flow and exchange of information concerning faculty**" also appeared among the ten greatest gaps for all groups (5th-9th), yet presents an issue of some considerable consternation that could be addressed without a need for expending already limited funds. In fact, as one faculty member noted, "With all the paper that floats around this place, they'd [sic] probably be able to save enough to offer a scholarship just by cutting back on the waste." For this faculty member, at any rate, pointing out the existence of the College-wide recycling program did not abate his indignation.

With regard to the **educational standards**, "integrity of the curriculum" revealed larger gaps between importance and satisfaction for all groups (4th-9th) except 5-year faculty (15th). For both 5-year and new faculty, "quality of upper-level student work" ranked tenth, while seminar faculty were more likely to indicate a larger gap than others (5th vs. 17th). "Standards of evaluation for student performance" showed a greater gap for 5-year faculty (10th) than for new faculty (17th), while seminar faculty vs. others were nearly even on this score (12th vs. 14th). Seminar participants found greater gaps on "quality of upper-level student work" (5th) and on the "narrative evaluation process (of students)" (10th) than their non-seminar counterparts (17th & 25th).

"**General working conditions,**" while not appearing among the top items for any of the groups on rankings for importance or satisfaction, did show a significant gap for both 5-year and new faculty (13th & 8th), as well as for non-seminar faculty (4th). The gap for seminar faculty on this item was relatively small (26th). The gap on "classroom space(s) and other teaching facilities" was greater for 5-year and non-seminar faculty (9th & 11th) vs. new and seminar faculty (28th & 19th).

Both 5-year and non-seminar faculty found greater disparity between importance and satisfaction regarding "**B.C. recognition of teaching accomplishments**" (4th & 6th), compared to new and seminar faculty (24th & 16th).

With regard to **faculty development**, despite relatively low rankings on the importance of "outside" opportunities, both the 5-year and seminar groups showed gaps among the top ten (6th & 9th), while non-seminar and new faculty showed less disparity (12th & 16th). On "in-house" opportunities, the 5-year and non-seminar groups found only an average disparity or less (21st & 30th), while the seminar and new faculty groups both found a significantly greater disparity (8th & 11th).

Finally and predictably, while the average gap between importance and satisfaction for all faculty on all items was 0.8, gaps were relatively small or non-existent on those aspects noted earlier as both important and satisfying, including (in descending order): Academic freedom, general support from the college in work with students, class size (all 0.4); and diversity of the student body (0.3) and support services to students (0.2).

A Prospectus on Adjunct Faculty Morale --

Two things stand out as most obvious from the survey results outlined above: On the one hand, the issue of faculty pay, a difficult issue under any circumstances, and more so in times of economic recession, needs nonetheless to be addressed. The fact that a Budget Committee was formed last year, with representatives from faculty and student constituencies, as well as staff, should ameliorate the sense of disenfranchisement expressed by many adjuncts. What it will not affect is the limited revenues with which the College is working. How this tension is resolved would seem to promise a direct and pervasive impact on faculty morale.

On a much more positive note, the fact that at least half of the ten items rated as most important by all faculty also appeared among the ten rated highest for satisfaction would seem to suggest that faculty morale is not, in itself, low. Rather, from this perspective at any rate, it would seem that morale is quite high on the questions of academic freedom (both generically and practically), general support of both faculty and students on student-related matters and services, and the relatively small class size. All these are significant strengths within the College culture which can and ought to be acknowledged.

The findings suggest, then, that it might be better to think of adjunct faculty morale, not as a question of all-encompassing strategies and faculty-wide effects, but in more discreet terms. One example may be the

relatively low satisfaction with "the general flow and exchange of information concerning faculty." This presents an issue of importance -- not only to faculty, but to the institution -- which might be readily susceptible to resolution, requiring time and dialogue, but not additional resources. The findings can also be viewed profitably by focusing on significant differences between the sub-groups -- of new vs. 5-year, and seminar vs. non-seminar participants. Here, for example, the questions of evaluating faculty performance and the integrity of the curriculum both showed significant differences between new and veteran faculty. Similarly, differences between seminar participants and others appeared, not only in the seminar participants' greater recognition of the importance of in-house faculty development, but on their understanding of the importance of narrative evaluations, the variety of learning modes, adequacy of basic skills among students, and clear lines of communication on teaching-related issues.

These and other gleanings from the survey results can help both the Faculty Association reps and the academic (as well as other) staff to identify and address specific questions and concerns, and not for all faculty only, but for valid differences which come with being novice or veteran, involved in faculty development or not. By doing so, one obvious advantage may be that it will keep the question of faculty morale, as well as questions like faculty development, focused on particulars. Moreover, the faculty and sub-group rankings can provide some sense of the hierarchy of interests and needs which, as further results are compiled, may be useful for setting the agenda for faculty initiatives, both over the short- and longer-term.

The Seminars --

Having established at least something of the broader context of morale among adjunct faculty at the College, it is possible now to view the results regarding the seminar in a better light.

As noted before, the value of the seminars -- for improving faculty morale and the importance participants come to place on opportunities for in-house faculty development -- was affirmed by nearly all participants. On the post-seminar evaluation, faculty rated the seminar highly "for its quality as a faculty development experience" and "in relation to other B.C. faculty development experiences" [a. & h., avg: 5.5/ range: 4.0-6.0]. In

addition, all participants noted that they would recommend the seminars to other faculty [item 4.], an aspect reflected also, perhaps, in the highest rating given to the seminars "as an opportunity to work with other B.C. faculty" [avg: 5.7/range:4.0-6.0]. The lowest rating among all items was "on the quality of the text" used, though this may have been as much a result of not incorporating the text more solidly into the discussions as from the quality of the text itself. Finally, most comments -- from the seminars, on the post-seminar evaluations, and in the informal follow-up interviews -- were extremely favorable. (A complete list of all narrative comments from the post-seminar evaluations is included in the Appendices ["Seminar Results"].)

Despite these favorable reviews, however, there are some discrepancies which appeared during the discussion of the results of the faculty-wide questionnaire survey which deserve closer inspection. The one clearly positive result of the seminars corroborated by the questionnaire survey showed that seminar faculty were the only group who rated the importance of "opportunities for in-house faculty development" highly. While a high rating on importance may, in part, help to explain why seminar participants showed greater dissatisfaction with "in-house" faculty development opportunities (The higher the rating of importance, the greater the possible gap.), that does not explain why seminar faculty ranked their satisfaction with in-house development opportunities lower than any other sub-grouping.

Given the high ratings of the seminar by participants on the post-seminar evaluation and elsewhere, two possible explanations suggest themselves: Either the seminars (especially in light of the fact that they were scheduled to continue after project funding, but subsequently cancelled) raised expectations for even more (and better?) in-house development activities which were subsequently unfulfilled, or the post-seminar evaluation ratings represent a high immediate assessment which subsequently diminished over time. Given the high attendance at subsequent all-seminar-faculty gatherings, and the continuing requests for "the seminars or something like them," diminished satisfaction seems unlikely. Therefore, one feature of the seminars that may need to be kept in mind is that faculty may actually develop a 'taste' for such activities, and the subsequent lack may spell even lower satisfaction on this issue after 'withdrawal'.

However that may be, a closer look at the seminar results is in order.

With regard to the premises of the design:

The extended format of the seminars: The original two-hour format of the seminars was modified over the funding period. The first two seminars (Fall 1989 and Spring 1990) both employed the two-hour, ten-meeting format. But in the Summer of 1990, for reasons of scheduling and in response to statements from prior semester participants, the format was changed to include two all-day sessions. The summer seminar thus ran with three two-hour sessions, with two all-day (9:30-4:30) sessions in between. Participant responses to the all-day sessions were very positive, so that one all-day session was retained in subsequent seminars.

Among narrative responses on the post-seminar evaluation, the opportunity to meet for an extended time, including the "all-day" sessions, was cited verbatim by six respondents -- either as what they liked best (item 2), or as the grounds for recommending the seminar to other faculty (item 4). Comments also noted the opportunity the seminars provided for "depth," and "for extended dialogue" and "sustained contact." Beyond the evaluations, nearly all participants commented on the extended format during seminar sessions or in interviews as one of the most valuable aspects of the seminar.

Nearly all faculty also commented upon the collegiality which resulted from the seminars. Evaluation comments noted "camaraderie," "a sense of common purpose and identity among teachers," and a "hope that this kind of showing will bring faculty closer together and stimulate intellectual discoveries." As one participant added, the seminar represented "the first real opportunity to get to know and appreciate [other faculty's] interests and concerns." This aspect was also reflected in the rated items on the post-seminar evaluation, where participants rated the seminar most highly "as an opportunity to work with other B.C. faculty," [g., avg: 5.7/range: 4.0-6.0], and in the narrative responses, where it was unanimously included among responses to what participants liked best (item 2), and included by 24 (75%) among their grounds for recommending the seminar to other faculty.

Finally, after the first all-day sessions were held in the summer of 1990, academic staff (one of whom participated in the seminar that summer) and Faculty Association representatives decided upon an all-day format for

semesterly faculty meetings. The result was an increase in attendance -- from the 5-10 that had become commonplace at the two-hour meetings and workshops, to 20-25 at the all-day sessions.

The emphasis on faculty experience: The focus upon faculty experience was an aspect of the seminars most often commented upon explicitly in the post-seminar evaluation narratives. In response to item 2, 24 participants (75%) cited such things as "the experiences and ideas of other teachers," "discussions of classroom experiences," "finding out what other teachers deal with in the classroom," "sharing of ideas/experiences," and the "discussions about teaching objectives and learning theories as exemplified by the experiences of the other teachers" as what they liked best about the seminars. Similarly, as one participant noted among the grounds for recommending the seminar to colleagues (item 4), "Particularly at a College where most of the faculty are adjunct, the chance to sit down and talk teaching with other teachers is a very worthwhile experience." Similar attitudes were also reflected in many evaluations, as well as in comments from the seminars and interviews, regarding the value of exchanging interdisciplinary ideas and experiences, detailed in the section following.

More than this, though, the emphasis upon faculty experience found affirmation in the participants' ready willingness, from the first sessions to the last, to have their experiences be the source and focus of much discussion. Many participants remarked particularly about the "open" exchange , and discussions often proved engaging enough so that some sessions would run "down to the wire" without complaint, or even awareness of the fact. Moreover, the seminars left many participants wanting to continue. In this regard, if there was a major shortcoming in our approach, it was that we did not video-tape all of the sessions. An edited video would have been not only solid evidence of the value of the seminar for participants, but an interesting primer for wider faculty development -- such was the forthcoming and informing nature of the discussions.

The emphasis upon the local context: The value of this aspect was reflected in two different types of responses. On the one hand, there were those faculty who expressed appreciation for the seminar's avoidance of "an educationist approach" to questions of teaching and learning' on the other,

many also noted the value of placing one's course within "the context of the Mission and Goals" of the College, something, as one faculty member noted, she'd "never given much thought to" prior to the seminar. Most of the relatively low ratings on "the quality of the text" [f., avg.: 4.2/ range: 2.0-6.0] may also reflect a preference for the local context, as shown in narrative responses which sometimes cited its lack of direct connection with teaching experiences at the College. Many also noted their preference for, as one participant put it, "wrestling together with problems we encounter in our classes," while others noted the discovery of "a root of common intent," or a preference for discussion which focused on "the realities of teaching here at Burlington College."

In addition, particularly among newer faculty, there were frequent comments concerning the value of the seminars in "getting a feel for the kind of teaching and the kinds of students" one encountered at the College. And among veteran faculty, particularly those with other post-secondary teaching experience, comments frequently affirmed the need for an awareness of this "different kind of teaching required" of faculty at the College, noting that, "the students demand it." The seminar also provided an opportunity for at least one participant to bridge the gap between teaching and administration. "It was quite helpful to me, as an administrator, to hear more about other faculty members' experiences *as teachers* [sic]."

Finally, and connected with the extended format of the seminars, many faculty made a direct connection between their adjunct status and the value of the seminars in helping them "feel more connected" to the community. One cited the seminars as a source of "an esprit de corps that will, I expect, carry over to interaction with members of the group for years to come." Another called the seminar "invaluable" given "so few opportunities at BC for faculty to get together for such open discussions." One participant noted that, "given the somewhat (and perhaps necessarily) scattered quality of adjunct faculty, opportunities like this are stimulating and helpful." Another wrote, "It brings the somewhat isolated teacher into contact with other teachers and ... [provides] an on-going sense of community among faculty who took the seminar." These comments may also help to explain the solid turnout at the all-day gatherings for all seminar participants, held at the end of the first and second years of the project. As one participant noted, "This type of interaction can generate -- *did*

generate -- a sense of common purpose and identity" among faculty.

The idea of teacher-as-researcher: Here again, it was the frequency and variety of narrative comments which affirmed this aspect of the seminars. Most participants cited the opportunity to focus and reflect on their teaching practices as one of the most valuable features of the seminars. Some participants noted "the stimulus to re-think and clarify the what and how of my own teaching," or the opportunity "to reflect on 11 years of teaching at BC." Another cited the value of putting "one's own ideas out front to these [other faculty] and see how they stood up to discussion." And the participant who cited the "sense of common purpose and identity" which the seminar generated, noted that it did so for faculty "as learners and researchers." Many other comments cited the "exchange" of "ideas," "strategies," "techniques," "solutions," or "philosophies" as most valuable. Another cited the seminar as an "excellent enjoyable experience" for the "insights on teaching for beginners and experienced" faculty both. Still another rated the seminar "light years ahead of a [usual] faculty meeting in content and quality for feedback and discussions on teaching." Another found the seminar "very useful to interact, gently challenge and/or reinforce one's concepts, stimulate new thinking (thinking, period?), exchange ideas..." Finally, another recommended the seminar to colleagues, "If they have some [teaching] issue they need to resolve for themselves."

In addition, many participants discussed changes and adaptations in their teaching practices during seminars, and many (in follow-up interviews) found themselves "more conscious of the experimental way I really proceed in my teaching" as a result of the seminars. Finally, closely tied to the next aspect, many faculty also found the seminars to be extremely valuable because of the context for writing in which it took place.

The writing requirement: Most faculty participants cited some aspect of the writing requirement on the evaluation among the features they liked best or the grounds for recommending the seminar to colleagues. For some, the greatest value of the writing was more personal, a matter of "being in the position of having to write" about their teaching. (Several went so far as to use the term 'forced', but always in quotes.) Another noted the fruits of "writing the paper to discover more of my own thoughts about

teaching." For others, the writing was a means to more social ends. One participant noted the "discussion of papers as a spring board for concrete discussion of adult education" among the best features of the seminar. Others valued the "supportive criticism," "getting feedback," or "commentary" on their papers. Other comments valued the features of the writing process which allowed, for example, the focus on the exchange of "ideas" or "techniques" to emerge from discussion of specific papers.

Approaches to the writing requirement appeared to be divided among three-quarters of participants -- between those who used the writing process as a kind of clarifying or problem-solving technique, to explore and examine current teaching strategies; and those who used it to detail what they thought of as proven strategies. Among the former were papers which, in the words of their authors: set out "to conduct something of an experiment" in order to discover "a framework for the study of literature which speaks both to the demands of teaching and to the involvement of students"; traced the events of "learning to learn to teach" writing; reflected "on twenty nagging questions" about the ways in which improvisation in "teaching and jazz" are similar; attempted to identify "the hidden learner" not always or immediately obvious to the teacher; explored the "apparent contradiction" between "teaching and therapy"; or asked straightforwardly (in a subtitle), "How do you teach craft without killing creativity?"

Among the papers which offered proven strategies were a few which focused on particular types of courses, e.g., "Biology for Adult Learners" and geography for those interested to know "What's in a Name?" Others focused on specific aspects of teaching in general, with suggestions to consider about "The First Class," "The Argument for Narrative Evaluation," "Creating a Place of Trust" in the classroom, or "A Critical Look at Critical Thinking."

A third group, six in all, used the occasion for writing to develop proposals for changes in College policies regarding teaching or the curriculum. These included papers on everything from paradigms (the "dominant paradigm of Western education" and "breaking the prison paradigm in education") through the questioning of the (recently adopted) "syllabus requirement," to proposals for "integrating art and music" across the curriculum and refining the math curriculum.

Beyond the seminars themselves, however, not only were the papers read

by other faculty, they also had a variety of other concrete results. Among them were unsolicited comments and dialogues between non-seminar participants and seminar faculty on the latter's papers, and faculty and school-wide meetings on some of the proposals for policy changes set forth in the papers, including the syllabus requirement and a proposal for more equitable compensation for team-teaching. The team-teaching proposal was, in fact, taken up by the academic staff and Faculty Association, and resulted in the first and on-going, if limited, series of team-taught courses, for which faculty will no longer be required to split the single instructor's rate. Seminar faculty also were invited by academic staff (and paid) to offer two-hour faculty development workshops in subsequent semesters, using seminar papers for the workshop themes. In addition, many faculty also contacted project staff to inquire about participating in the seminar as a direct result of having read one or more seminar publications; and one participant has been using the seminar publications as required readings in his education courses, both at Burlington College and the local community college. And finally, plans are currently underway for the development of a faculty newsletter, a portion of which will be devoted to short essays by faculty about teaching and learning.

A full sampling of papers from the seminars appears in the Appendices ["Faculty Seminar Papers"] at the end of this report.

The interdisciplinary membership: As can be seen from the demographics of participants compiled from the faculty-wide questionnaire and included in Appendices ["Seminar Results"], of the 25 participants identified, the majority were nearly evenly divided between the Humanities (12, including faculty from the areas of history, literature, philosophy, and education) and the Arts (11, primarily faculty from the studio/fine arts). Math and the Sciences accounted for 6 participants (including faculty teaching math and those from the areas of general science, geography, biology, etc.), while Psychology faculty accounted for only 4 participants, somewhat fewer than a representative sample. There were no participants from the few teaching in the Business area of the curriculum. These numbers are relatively proportional to the overall number of faculty, with the exception of the Psychology faculty, as noted. (At least four additional Psychology faculty had expressed strong interest in the seminars, but were

unable to participate because of scheduling limitations or difficulties.)

The value of the interdisciplinary membership was highly regarded by participants, both as one of the best features of the seminars and as grounds for recommending it to other faculty. Participant responses on the post-seminar evaluation commented on opportunities to exchange ideas "with colleagues of different training and areas of interest," to see "connections between disciplines," "to understand the thinking of colleagues in very different disciplines," for "cross-disciplinary perspectives on teaching and learning at BC," and "to exchange philosophies and techniques with other faculty, especially in disciplines quite different from one's own." One participant noted, somewhat poetically, that "active interdisciplinary work seems to be the best way to knit together a 'handsome' faculty fabric."

Finally, as noted above, team teaching was one of the themes which emerged from the seminars, and a proposal for team teaching came from an interdisciplinary team of seminar participants who met at one of the seminar 'reunions'. The team is scheduled to teach one of the two team slots available College-wide this coming spring (1992) semester.

Payment for involvement: While few participants commented directly about the honorarium on the post-seminar evaluation, many more faculty were certainly influenced by the payment. A number of participants, after the end of a seminar, remarked that they were originally "encouraged" or "enticed" by the prospect of payment. And while many said that they'd had a very positive and productive experience which they "would like to repeat," nonetheless, they confided their uncertainty about whether they would do so without "some sort of compensation, even if it's not as much" as they were paid originally. Still others, who had not, finally, participated but who'd wanted to, confided that it was the relatively low honorarium which kept them from doing so. As one put it, "I've got a family and have to make ends meet, and I just can't justify the time, even though I'd like to."

The Negative Aspects of the Seminars --

The negative aspect of the seminar which appeared most frequently on the post-seminar evaluation was "the text." Of the 24 faculty participants

who actually noted anything negative on the post-seminar evaluations (of the 8 who had no negative comments, 5 either left item 3 blank or wrote "no comment" or the like, while 3 used the item to note, not only that they had no negative comment, but to reiterate a positive summary), 9 of the 24 (37.5%) identified the text. However, even here, three appended relatively positive, if limited, comments regarding the text, and another two noted they may have found it more useful or interesting if it had been more solidly incorporated into the seminars. On the other hand, another two noted a tolerant attitude toward the text, but also a distinct preference for "discussion of shared experience." Additional readings -- photocopied handouts which varied from seminar to seminar -- received mixed reviews, with some participants including them in their negative assessments of the text, while others distinguished their appreciation of the readings from their negative response to the text. All this is in line with the fact that, of all the rated items on the post-seminar evaluation, the text was clearly rated lowest [avg: 4.2/range: 2.0-6.0].

Other negative criticisms of the seminar were much more scattered. "Discussions" received criticism from 6 faculty; but comments were divided between those which criticised the "too abstract," and those which criticised the "too concrete" nature of discussions. Two faculty criticised the lack of focus or veering away of some discussions (while others praised the free-flow exchange in the preceding item). One also found "too much anecdotal material" in the seminars (again, something contradicted by other positive assessments). Finally, several faculty suggested various alternatives for working with faculty papers and the writing process, and one participant indulged in self-criticism. Beyond these, there were no other substantial criticisms of the seminars from participants. But there was one other from a perspective outside the seminars which bears mention.

At least one academic staff member expressed concern that, because of the honorarium, it might be difficult for the College to "live up to" the seminar's "rewards" for faculty involvement. Had the seminars been continued on at least a once-a-year basis with five to seven faculty, this criticism may not have been as potentially problematic as it may yet prove to be. At that rate, longer-term faculty would have had an opportunity to participate in the seminar every four to six years, with involvement in other, less "rewarding," but also less time-consuming, development activi-

ties in the interim. Without their continuation, however, it may be that, while seminar participants' involvement in the on-going faculty (all-day) retreats is high, their interest may dwindle as time takes them further from the initial reward. At this point, it is impossible to predict.

A Prospectus on Adjunct Faculty Development --

From a variety of perspectives, then, the seminars proved successful.

With a view to the premises of the seminar design, and from the perspective of the seminar participants, the results may be summarized as follows:

> Instead of the limited time of faculty meetings or workshops, the seminars provided a means whereby faculty could spend an extended period of time together, which participants found useful both for the time to focus on teaching and learning, and for the collegiality which developed as a result.
>
> Instead of outside experts, the seminars provided faculty with a forum in which to draw from and reflect upon their own experiences. Participants found this emphasis on their experience provided a litmus test for theoretical concerns, and practical exchange of ideas.
>
> Instead of an approach to teaching and learning through a framework of general theory, the participants found that the seminars provided them with a framework in which to look for the theoretical assumptions which lay behind their teaching practices, and to place those practices, as well as their course offerings, within the larger context of the Mission & Goals of the College.
>
> Instead of research within their particular disciplines, the seminar provided faculty with a "stimulus to re-think and clarify" their teaching practices with the same sort of inquiring eye they would bring to studies within their own disciplines.
>
> Instead of writing as strictly an end product for others within their disciplines, participants valued the writing process a a means for further exploring and refining their ideas. As an end product, final papers promoted faculty discourse about teaching and learning throughout the community.
>
> Instead of reinforcing a discipline-specific culture of specialization, participants found the interdisciplinary membership of the seminars promoted mutual understanding, broader collegiality, cross-fertilization of methods and materials, and team teaching. And finally,
>
> instead of asking adjuncts to do more for less, payment of honoraria provided a tangible sign that the institution values their time and effort.

These, in sum, were the premises upon which the seminars were built, and which were explicitly valued by the seminar faculty in practice. While they do not necessarily suggest that the seminars are the only, or even the

best, form for faculty development, those aspects which participants found most useful ought continue to to inform future faculty development activities, as, for example, the all-day retreats.

But there were not only positive outcomes.

It would seem that, while seminar participants now recognize the value and importance of in-house faculty development, other faculty may not have as strong or as ready an appreciation of its possibilities. Similarly, the recognition of the value of "outside" faculty development opportunities appears to be weak among all faculty groups, although the limited resources which the College has to underwrite such outside activities would seem to preclude the possibility for accomplishing much in this area over the short term. The question of faculty development, then, has not been "solved" by the seminars, and continuing attention will be needed if the gains made by the FIPSE-funded seminars are not to be lost. There are, however, other positive outcomes to note.

While the College has not, in fact, picked up the seminars as of this writing, nonetheless, the seminars have had some influence on the collaboration between academic staff and Faculty Association reps in new approaches to faculty development activities, including the newly established all-day retreat each semester. Moreover, the investment in the seminars, albeit through FIPSE funds, does appear to have contributed to the establishment of a higher standard for investing in the faculty for teaching-related functions; and it may be a standard from which the College is reluctant to retreat, in part because of the improved morale and other acknowledged effects of the seminars. In part, this new standard is reflected not only in the new and, for the first time, significant budget for faculty development (an increase from $500 per year to more than $4000 over the course of the project), but also in the compensation of F.A. reps for their service. Also, beginning this semester (Fall 1991), faculty teaching courses are being paid to hold "office hour" tutoring and mentoring through the College's Student Support Services (TRIO) program. With more than three-quarters of the student body eligible for SSS, this represents a positive addition to the role of the all-adjunct faculty. The change came in large part as a direct result of interests and concerns expressed in seminar discussions in which the Director of SSS participated (Summer 1990) as an adjunct, and which she subsequently and successfully incorporated into the

annual SSS proposal. Moreover, there is a good chance that interested faculty will also be paid to write articles for students on teaching and learning which will be published in the newsletter of the Educational Resources Center (ERC). (The ERC is the parent facility of the SSS program, with the majority of staff and other funding coming from SSS.)

In addition to these outcomes, several more positive notes deserve mention: Our contacts with other area colleges have prompted staff members there to express interest in some sort of collaboration concerning adjunct faculty development, a prospect for which we will continue to lay the groundwork in the coming year. At least one faculty member has been using copies of the seminar publications in his education courses -- both at Burlington College and the local community college. Students at the College identified faculty development from among a wide range of concerns as their highest priority for institutional advancement in the coming year. And finally, the seminars, in some discernible form, may yet find the institutional funding to continue reallocated.

Finally, the existence of the Faculty Association, ratified by a change in the by-laws, attests to the understanding that the College's all-adjunct faculty requires some sort of mechanism for an effective voice. Most importantly, however, there was, and is still, a strong sense of the community and culture upon which the College was founded -- both among veteran and new faculty, and among staff and students -- and that has certainly played a part in the relative successes, both of the project and the College. And this, along with those things already mentioned, represent positive steps toward an institutional culture which supports both the importance and the possibilities for adjunct faculty morale and faculty development.

Summary & Conclusions: High Hopes in a Context of Limited Resources

What began as a much more circumscribed venture -- to conduct a series of adjunct faculty development seminars -- became, of necessity, a much more comprehensive exploration into the conditions of adjunct faculty employment and the sources of adjunct faculty morale, both locally and nationally.

As we have seen, because of changes in student demographics and the uncertain enrollments which accompanied them, economic pressures resulted in changes in both the number and the identity of adjunct faculty over the past decade or more. And these changes, coupled with limited opportunities for residence and tenure-track positions and a recession economy, have combined to create circumstances in which many adjuncts see themselves as "migrant workers" in the fields of higher education.

Under such circumstances, the questions of faculty morale and faculty development among adjuncts present significant challenges to those institutions which find themselves increasingly reliant upon adjuncts in order to maintain the breadth and number of offerings to support the diversity of programs. Yet, ironically, despite the fact that adjuncts are hired, first and foremost, to teach, they are the least likely group in the teaching force to be able to take advantage of the usual faculty development activities associated with residence and tenure, i.e., paid development opportunities and sabbaticals. Moreover, as structurally disenfranchised members of their schools, adjuncts are also infrequently in a position either to be integrally a part of the institutional community and culture, to to affect policy.

It was in this context, among increasing expressions of low morale and disaffection among our own, all-adjunct faculty at Burlington College, that we undertook the task of trying to build morale and improve instruction by offering the series of faculty development seminars on "Teaching & Learning Across the Curriculum."

In order to obtain a clearer picture of faculty morale, and to place the seminars within the larger context of that morale, project staff conducted a series of informal interviews with adjunct faculty and, subse-

quently, put together a comprehensive faculty-wide questionnaire survey on faculty morale and faculty development, based in large part on gleanings from the interviews. Responses of all faculty, as well as several sub-groupings of faculty -- including 5-year veteran vs. new faculty, and seminar participants vs. non-participants -- were examined. As we saw, preliminary findings from the interviews and survey showed that faculty morale was by no means a homogeneous phenomenon, but showed a function relationship with specific variables of institutional culture, policy, and working conditions. Morale, when measured as a function of the gap between importance and satisfaction, revealed high morale among the all-adjunct faculty at the College in a variety of areas -- including academic freedom, general support from the College in work with students, student support services, and relatively small class size. On the other hand, the greatest gaps between expectations and satisfaction for all groupings centered on various aspects of compensation -- for teaching, teaching-related, and non-teaching functions. Other gaps were noted for the different sub-groups, and ought to be reviewed to inform more specific approaches to practices and policies regarding faculty.

Faculty development -- including both "in-house" and "outside" opportunities -- was not regarded as particularly important by any of the sub-groupings *except the seminar participants*, who rated the importance of in-house development opportunities significantly more highly. Nonetheless, satisfaction with in-house development opportunities among seminar participants was also the lowest among all groups, perhaps partially explained by the disappointment of participants at the lack of continuing opportunities for more intensive faculty development activities, or the lack of compensation for continuing participation in the more limited activities still available.

With regard to the seminar itself, all participants rated the seminar highly on nearly all points. On the post-seminar evaluation ratings, all aspects of the seminar were rated above the median rating, and only the text used was rated relatively low, there and in narrative comments. High marks were given the seminars as an opportunity to work with other faculty, for its interdisciplinary value, for its quality as a faculty development experience, and, among veteran faculty, in relation to other College fac-

ulty development experiences at the College.

Narrative comments on the post-seminar evaluations, as well as discussions and interviews with participants, confirmed these findings, and also substantiated the major premises upon which the seminars were built, including improvements derived from collegiality, the focus and school-wide discourse on "teaching & learning," the interdisciplinary understanding and cross-fertilization of methods and materials, the emphasis on local culture, and more. That the seminar approach may be useful in and of itself, and not only for adjunct faculty, appears to be a given. But the high ratings on those aspects of the seminar design noted above obviously represent issues closely connected with improvements in adjunct faculty morale, as well.

All these things point to a very positive series of outcomes, with regard both to identifying sources of adjunct faculty morale, and to the efficacy of the seminars in improving faculty morale and instruction. But all has taken place, both locally and in the wider national context, in a context of diminishing resources and, therefore, diminished opportunities.

The seminars, while planned to be picked up by the College initially, were not because of a significant drop in enrollments and revenues. Nonetheless, the seminar model has had a direct effect on the reshaping of current and future faculty development activities, as well as on the actual funds allocated for same. Moreover, even students had strongly endorsed institutionalized priority for a faculty development initiative. In addition, a number of ancillary results of the seminars, including the prospect for inter-institutional collaboration on adjunct faculty development with other area colleges, paid "office hours" for adjuncts, and the prospect of a faculty newsletter, emerged.

As for the "core" or "senior" faculty question, the College may be in a particularly poor position at this point to permanently enfranchise any number of faculty. And the question of whether a still-young institution ought to consider locking itself into additional "fixed costs" needs to be considered carefully by all concerned. But the fact is -- while it was not a question on the survey and probably ought to have been -- who, exactly, among the faculty are interested in a more permanent and relatively guaranteed position appears to be yet another aspect of the adjunct faculty's

differing expectations and levels of satisfaction.

On the other hand, the more or less permanent enfranchisement of an administrative staff will probably be a constant object of both attention and some tension -- the inverse of the usual situation among higher education institutions, where the faculty are entrenched and the administrative staff are low on the proverbial totem pole. How this issue is addressed, and who is empowered to affect it, pose two questions which may well be critical to the future of the College.

As noted early on in this report, the attraction of hiring adjuncts at many institutions originated in considerations of cost-efficiency. Part of that efficiency comes from the absence of fixed salary costs, and of fringe benefits, an especially prohibitive factor with the continuing and dramatic increases in, for example, group health insurance rates. No doubt, honoraria for adjunct faculty participation in seminars like these, or for any other development activities, represent an additional expenditure not currently 'on the books', either at Burlington College or at most other institutions. Nonetheless, if faculty development is going to be a priority, and if adjunct faculty are particularly susceptible to a sense of estrangement from the college community in which they work -- including its culture of educational values and practices -- then some provision must be made to compensate faculty for their time outside the classroom. This was borne out quite emphatically in the results of the questionnaire.

Beyond all these considerations, though, there are important questions of both community and commitment -- among faculty, staff, and students alike.

At Burlington College, the sense of community and strength of commitment has always, even in times of greater and lesser crises, been a source of morale. Very few, it seems, actually feel so outside the College community that they do not take an active concern, and, more often, acts of service, in order to preserve what is valuable about the College, and to help it to continue to grow and improve.

There are limits to such service, of course, often dictated by "extracurricular" considerations -- of other work, or of home and family. And, especially in a context of economic constraints, part of the result may come in the form of argument and disagreement. Such tensions are under-

standable, or at least, ought to be. There are no miraculous cures for limited resources which can, at once, raise faculty and staff pay, maintain or extend fringe benefits, equip classrooms and computer labs with more state-of-the-art technologies, and lower tuition and fees.

Such a situation is bound to create friction. But there is a distinct and important difference between friction and low morale.

While it must be acknowledged that endless friction will most likely take a toll on morale, there is a type of frictionlessness which may belie an absence of morale altogether. Friction can only come about when there is contact. And friction can only last when power and authority -- and concern -- is distributed, thus keeping one individual or group from structurally and permanently 'fixing' it.

The point is: Where there is no contact, no common point of awareness, no common cares or concerns, there is not simply a lack of friction, but indifference. And the good news is, finally, there are very few if any at Burlington College who seem to be altogether indifferent. In fact, very few seem to be indifferent about very little. And that, when all is said and done, may be the best litmus test of all of morale.

Morale among the all-adjunct faculty at Burlington College might, to an outsider, seem somewhat fickle. Depending upon who you speak with, and what you speak about, you may encounter unqualified praise for the College, or some pretty severe criticism. But, on closer inspection, if you took the time to discover something about the speaker -- whether, for example, he or she is a new-comer or a veteran -- and if you were attentive to the shifts in subject as the conversation unfolded, odds are you would find that there are differences and patterns, both, on this question of faculty morale.

What you are unlikely to encounter, however, is a shrug of the shoulders to signify an unwillingness to talk about Burlington College. If its the diversity of students you want to talk about, or academic freedom... If its the support available, to students and faculty alike, and the small class size which help to assure a successful and individualized education for all... or, on the flip side, if its the meager pay and demanding work, or the concerns about the adequacy of student skills... most faculty are more than willing to bend an ear, and have their own bent in the process.

And, make no mistake, this willingness is not mere politeness, nor is it limited to the faculty alone. It is a product of a kind of morale which one encounters when there's lots of good work to be done, but scarcely enough time or resources to keep up with the vision of how it might be.

Adjunct faculty morale, then, and the closely allied question of faculty development, are and ought to be questions of concern and attention -- for the academic staff, the Faculty Association reps, and, not least, the adjunct faculty themselves. But in the two years of the FIPSE project -- because of the seminars **and** because of the efforts of the academic staff, the F.A. reps, the staff of the Education Resources Center, and others -- there have been significant changes in the structure, scope, and funding for faculty and faculty development activities. And faculty development at the College -- the focus on teaching and learning, the collegiality, and the sense of common purpose -- is probably better than its ever been.

Finally, in light of the economic uncertainty of the times, it would be foolishness to predict the future of either faculty development or the morale of the all-adjunct faculty at Burlington College. Yet, all things being equal, and given the level of commitment to the College community and its culture, the situation would seem to offer a reason for hopefulness for all concerned.